

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <div style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</div> <div style="text-align: center;">vs.</div> MAURICE THOMAS, <div style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</div>)))))))))))	8:05CR295 ORDER
---	---	--------------------------------------

This matter is before the court on the motion to continue by defendant Maurice Thomas (Thomas) (Filing No. 24). Thomas seeks a continuance of the trial of this matter scheduled for December 5, 2005. Thomas's counsel represents that counsel for the government has no objection to the motion. Thomas has submitted an affidavit in accordance with paragraph 9 of the progression order whereby Thomas consents to the motion and acknowledges he understands the additional time may be excludable time for the purposes of the Speedy Trial Act. Upon consideration, the motions will be granted.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Thomas's motion to continue trial (Filing No. 24) is granted.
2. Trial of this matter is re-scheduled for **January 17, 2006**, before Chief Judge Joseph F. Bataillon and a jury. The ends of justice have been served by granting such motion and outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The additional **time** arising as a result of the granting of the motion, i.e., the time between **November 28, 2005 and January 17, 2006**, shall be deemed **excludable** time in any computation of time under the requirement of the Speedy Trial Act for the reason that defendant's counsel requires additional time to adequately prepare the case. The failure to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B).

DATED this 28th day of November, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge